

Elihu Online Papers

Presented by

Elihu Books, LLC

Elihu continued and said:

“Bear with me a little, and I will show you, for I have yet something to say on God’s behalf.”
—Job 36:1-2 (NRSV)

The Letter of JudeA New Translation According to the Text of P^{72*}

Greg Stafford**

(1) Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ, but a brother of James, to those who have been loved by God the Father and who have been called to be kept under safe watch by Jesus Christ. (2) May you be filled with mercy, peace, and love. (3) Dearly loved ones, while I am making every effort to write to you concerning our shared salvation, I felt a more urgent need to write to you, pleading that you struggle hard for the faith which was for all time entrusted to the holy ones. (4) Because certain men have infiltrated the congregations, those who were written about long ago according to this judgment, those who are without God, the ones who change the mercy of our God into conduct that is morally unrestrained, and in so doing they are denying our [only] Absolute Ruler and our Lord Jesus Christ.^α (5) But I want to remind you about what you have for all time already come to know well, namely, that a divine being, Christ, saved people out of Egypt, but then he destroyed those who did not believe.^β (6) Also, remember the angels who did not pay close attention to their own beginning^γ but, rather, who gave up their own place of dwelling only to be restrained with continual bonds under the authority of a dark place. (7) Remember how Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities surrounding them lived openly, obviously immoral lives by chasing after different types of flesh.^δ These things are set before them as an indication^ε of continual destruction,^ς which is what they undergo as a punishment. (8) In fact, in the same way these ones are obsessed all the time with flesh, on the one hand as an affront to authority,^η but they are also rejecting the presence of glorious beings,^θ and even blaspheming. (9) Yet, when Michael the Archangel was disputing with the Devil, as they considered^ι Moses' body, even he did not take it upon himself to pronounce a judgment that was blasphemous.^κ Instead, Michael said to the Devil, "May Lord [Jaho(h)-ah] address you."^λ (10) But the people about whom I am writing to you, on the one hand they blaspheme whatever they do not understand, then on the other hand whatever is instinctive they claim to know, like an animal without reason, and yet according to these very same instincts they have been

brought to ruin.^μ **(11)**It is hard to believe what is going on with them, because they travel the way of Cain; they gave themselves over to the deception of financial gain shown by Balak;^ν and by the type of rebellion shown by Korah they are lost. **(12)**These ones are perilous threats when you eat together in your expressions of spiritual^ξ love. They look out for their own advantage. They are waterless clouds swept along by the winds, trees ready for harvest but without any fruit, twice, and so ready for death by uprooting. **(13)**They are wild waves of the sea, foaming up their own shameful conduct, stars that have lost their place for which deep darkness has been kept ready for the coming age. **(14)**Even Enoch, the seventh man from Adam, spoke beforehand concerning these infiltrators, saying, “Behold! The Lord comes with thousands of angels! **(15)**He brings about judgment concerning all things and he makes plain the error of every living thing, concerning all kinds of terrible things which they spoke against him, in spite of their being wicked sinners.”^ο **(16)**These ones are constant complainers, unhappy with life, yet they still proceed according to their own desires. Their mouth speaks what is exceedingly immoderate, as they marvel at various people for the sake of their own personal gain. **(17)**But you, dearly loved ones, you remember the sayings^π which were purposefully spoken beforehand by the apostles of our Lord, Jesus Christ, **(18)**namely, what we spoke to you, that during^ρ the last period of time there will be those who treat others with contempt, as they proceed according to their own wicked desires. **(19)**These are the ones who wrongly separate you from each other, like physical creatures but without any spirit. **(20)**But you, dearly loved ones, restrengthen^ς your own holy faith with holy spirit, praying constantly for yourselves. **(21)**Closely guard yourselves in God’s love, as you receive the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ during the present period of time.^ο **(22)**Now, those who doubt^τ you must snatch from the fire. **(23)**Yet, be both merciful and in fear, all the while turning away from even the inner garment that has been stained by the flesh. **(24)**To the one who is able to make you spotless, without blemish, making sure that with extreme joy you are morally pure in the sight of his glory, **(25)**to our only God to whom be glory, honor, and strength through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom be glory and greatness even now, and in all of the ages to come. Amen. Letter of Jude.

Notes

* P⁷² contains the earliest witness to the text of the Letter of Jude. It is a papyrus dated to the third century CE, found in northeast Egypt, in Jabal Abu Mana, and acquired the 1950s by Martin Bodmer. This translation of the Letter of Jude is preceded to some degree by my “Day Text” tweets for the “ElihuBooks” Twitter account for the period from August 5 to August 12, 2011. However, changes have been made where appropriate in

several places so a more formal presentation of this new translation of Jude, whom many believe to have been Jesus of Nazareth's half sibling, could be better presented. The printed text of P⁷² used for this English translation of the Letter of Jude is provided in *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts: New and Complete Translations with Photographs*, Philip W. Comfort, David Barrett, eds. (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 2001). I have also considered and compared the text of Jude in P⁷² with the text of Jude in *Novum Testamentum Graecum, Editio Critica Major IV, Part 1.4, Catholic Letters* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2005), and in the United Bible Societies' *The Greek New Testament* 3rd (1983) and 4th (1993) Editions (Stuttgart), as well as the Nestle-Aland 26th Edition of *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979). For more on my Twitter "Day Texts" see, "Day Texts from the Bible – Twitter," *Watching the Ministry* (March 13, 2010). For a further discussion of P⁷² and of the Bodmer Codex to which it once belonged, see Tommy Wasserman, "Papyrus 72 and the *Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex*," *New Testament Studies* 51 (2005), pages 137-154.

** Greg Stafford is President of Elihu Books, LLC, a book, video, and audio publishing company related to the educational and ministerial activities of Christian Witnesses of Jah around the world. For more on Stafford's activities and writings, see the menu links at <http://www.elihubooks.com>.

^a The reference here to "our [only] Absolute Ruler and our Lord Jesus Christ" should be understood as a reference to *two* distinct individuals, namely, Jaho(h)-ah the Father and Jesus of Nazareth, the one whom Christians believe became both "Lord" and "Christ" in obedience to his God (Acts 2:36; compare John 20:17, Hebrews 1:9, and Revelation 3:12). In P⁷² this part of Jude 4 ("Our [only] Absolute Ruler and our Lord Jesus Christ") translates the expression in Greek, τὸν ἡμῶν δεσπότην καὶ κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἡμῶν (*ton hēmōn despotēn kai kyrion Iēsoun Christon hēmōn*). The word for "only" (μόνον, *monon*) appears by a comparison with the readings in other manuscripts to have been miswritten as the word for "law" (νόμον, *nomon*) in P⁷². Comfort (*New Testament Text and Translation Commentary* [Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 2008], page 801) therefore rightly notes this deletion suggests *monon* may have been in the text from which P⁷² was copied, and then simply crossed out by the P⁷² scribe rather than corrected to include the right word for "only" (*monon*). Because of this, I have put "only" in brackets to show it was not actually used in P⁷², though it does appear it should have been used rather than left out entirely after the mistake was noted by the P⁷² scribe. Other important variants of this part of Jude 4 include τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, found in P⁷⁸ (late 3rd/early 4th century CE), Ⲙ (4th century CE), B (4th century CE), A (5th century CE), C (5th century CE), as well as the much later and far less attested reading found in Ψ (8th/9th century CE) and P (9th century CE), namely (with my emphasis added to the main variant), τὸν μόνον δεσπότην **θεόν** καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν. Here the pronoun *hēmōn* ("of us") does not give as clear of an impression of a separate specification as we find with the placement of *hēmōn* in other readings (especially in P⁷² [see below]). In spite of this, there are some who surprisingly view the addition of *theos* in the above two and other late variants as significant enough of a difference so that it creates a likely change in referents from one individual ("Jesus Christ") to *two* individuals ("God" and "Jesus"). For example, Roger L. Omanson, *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 2006), page 520, writes:

According to the variant reading θεόν [*theon*, "G-god"], δεσπότην [*despotēn*, "Absolute Ruler"] clearly refers to God the Father. According to the reading [without "G-god"] in [P⁷⁸, Ⲙ, B, A, C, and others], *despotēn* may refer either to God the Father or to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Additionally, Daniel B. Wallace (*Granville Sharp's Canon and Its Kin: Semantics and Significance*, ed., D.A. Carson, *Studies in Biblical Greek*, vol. 14 [New York: Peter Lang, 2009], page 235, note 3) writes that "with the addition of [*theon*, 'G-god']" the use of Jude 4 as a Granville "Sharp's rule" example is "effectively destroyed along with an explicit reference to Christ as God." Of course, when Wallace here speaks of "Christ as God" he does *not* mean Christ as the Trinity, though that is the "one God" of Wallace and of other Trinitarians. What Wallace and other Trinitarians mean by "God" for Jesus is that he is "a 'person' of God," consistent with a biblically undefined, unsupported, and contradicted tri-personal metaphysic that is, in spite of this, *always* associated by Trinitarians with the terms for "G-god" used of the Father and of Jesus in the Bible. Indeed, because of Trinitarians such as Sharp and Wallace, Greek syntax has been used to try and help prop up and even to promote Trinitarian interpretations of biblical texts. Yet, here in Jude 4 the terms used in the first

and second parts of the *kai* (“and”)-joined expression can easily stand alone as fixed references, first to God the Father and then in the second instance the terms of significance (“Lord” and “Christ”) are directly associated with and attached to the actual proper name used in the subject syntax, namely, “Jesus.” Wallace writes that because “‘our Lord Jesus Christ’ usually comprises an appositional expression that is equivalent to a proper name, ... the expression in Jude 4 could be similar to 2 Thess 1:12.” Nevertheless, Wallace believes the readings which place *hēmōn* after *kai kyrion* (“and Lord”) present “the only Absolute Ruler and Lord” as “fitting Sharp’s canon,” meaning Jude 4 “is affirming that both [*despotēs*, ‘Absolute Ruler’] and [*kyrion*, ‘Lord’] describe the same person, Jesus Christ” (*Granville Sharp’s Canon and Its Kin*, page 235, note 3). Yet, P⁷² presents “Lord Jesus Christ” without any separation of the terms of significance and the proper name that is explicitly used. By all appearances, then, and by Wallace’s own admission, P⁷² contains a ‘tighter’ expression than we find in the other readings which do separate “Lord” from “Jesus Christ” with the possessive pronoun *hēmōn*. In either case, we have in the first instance of P⁷² a term of significance (*despotēs*) which clearly may stand alone (or with *monon* [“only]) as a fixed reference to the Father who, other than human “masters” as a group (Titus 2:9; 1 Peter 2:18; 1 Timothy 6:1, 2), is the only one clearly referred to as *despotēs* in the New Testament (Luke 2:29; Acts 4:24; Revelation 6:10). In 2 Timothy 2:21 and 2 Peter 2:1 the referent could be either God the Father or the Lord Jesus. In the LXX, *despotēs* occurs in a similarly small pool of texts by comparison with other terms, but there is nonetheless a clearly fixed reference in the use of the term to Jaho(h)-ah in at least forty-three (43) instances (see Genesis 15:2, 8; Isaiah 1:24; 3:1; 10:33; 1 Esdras 4:60; Judith 9:12; Tobit 3:14; 8:17; 2 Maccabees 5:17, 20; 6:14; 9:13; 15:22; 3 Maccabees 2:2; 5:12; 6:5, 10; Odes 7:37; 13:29; Job 5:8; Wisdom 6:7; 8:3; 11:26; 13:3, 9; Proverbs 29:25; Sirach 23:1; 34:24; 36:1; Susanna 1:5; Jonah 4:3; Jeremiah 1:6; 4:10; 15:11; Epistle of Jeremiah 1:5; Daniel 3:37; 9:8, 15, 16, 17 [twice], 19). Still, at least once it is used of Jaho(h)-ah’s angel who in addition to *despotēs* is called the *archistratēgos dynamōs kyriou* (“the chief commander of Lord [Jaho(h)-ah’s] powers”). In the book of Judith *despotēs* is used of Holofernes, “chief leader of all the sons of Ammon” (Judith 5:5), a total of five (5) times (5:20, 24; 7:9, 11; 11:10). It is also used five (5) times of a human “master” and “masters” in contrast to a human “servant” and “servants” (Wisdom 18:11; Proverbs 17:2; 22:7; 30:10; Sirach 3:7). In 4 Maccabees 2:24 it is used once (1) of “reason” (*ho logismos*) and in 4 Maccabees 6:31 and 18:2 it is used twice (2) of “spiritual reason” (*ho eusebēs logismos*). Finally, *despotēs* is used once (1) as part of an analogy involving the ant who even though “not under the authority of an absolute ruler/master,” it “prepares a lot of food during the summer, and also during harvest time it makes its own storehouse of supplies.” This shows what we already know when it comes to many terms of significance with fixed reference, such as “Lord,” “God,” and even “Father,” namely, they can also have a general or other, less significant application to other individuals or to other things, including abstractions, all without taking away from the sense or fixed reference reserved for the most significant use(s) of the same terms (for “L-lord” and “G-god” compare Matthew 22:42-45 [see also Psalm 82:1, 6; 110:1; John 10:33-36; Acts 2:34; 1 Corinthians 8:4-6; Philippians 3:19; and Revelation 7:14; for “F-father,” compare the different senses used with this term in John 8:39 for Abraham and then for God in John 8:41). Compare the special (highest) sense that is apparently attached to *despotēs* when used of Jaho(h)-ah in at least two of the forty-three texts cited earlier, namely, Wisdom 6:7 and 8:3. In these texts we find *ho pantōn despotēs* (“the Absolute Ruler of all things”) If this type of fixed reference is meant in Jude 4 then it would almost certainly mean Jaho(h)-ah the Father (even as it appears to mean already, according to the overall reading in P⁷²), though a similar type of fixed significance for *despotēs* could still have developed for Jesus by the time of the writing of Jude’s letter, in light of what was believed to have been given to Jesus by Jaho(h)-ah the Father according to Matthew 28:18 (compare Daniel 7:13-14; Philippians 2:5-11). Ultimately, the sense for terms of potentially fixed reference and significance must be gained from the immediate and larger contexts of writing and thought found in association with the uses of such terms, rather than determined anachronistically, that is, read or understood in the light of *later* doctrinal developments, which is precisely what we find when it comes to many biblical terms that come to be used in Trinitarianism. When it comes to the text of Jude 4 in P⁷², it is worth noting again the placement of *hēmōn* in the first and in the second instances, since *hēmōn* first occurs between the article and the noun in the first part of the expression and then again at the very end of the expression (unlike P⁷⁸, ⲁ, A, B, C, and others in which *hēmōn* separates “Lord” from “Jesus Christ”), *after* the fixed reference to “Lord Jesus Christ” (*kyrion Iēsoun Christon hēmōn*). With all of this considered, there is strong support for translating this part of Jude 4 in P⁷² as, “Our [only] Absolute Ruler and our Lord Jesus Christ.” For more on the Granville Sharp rule and Daniel B. Wallace’s “Sharper rule,” see my “Another Exception to Granville Sharp’s Canon and Its Kin: A Further Response to Dan Wallace (With an Appendix),”

Elihu Online Papers 2 (July 26, 2010 [rev. January 18, 2011]); see also my pending, *The “Sharpest Rule”: A Review and Restatement of Greek’s Most Tragic Rule*, forthcoming through Elihu Books.

^β Here in verse 5 there are two other very important descriptions for Jesus, in addition to “Christ.” The first is similar to the opening of John’s Great Message (1:1), namely, that the Word who was “with God” was also “a divine being” or “a god” (*theos*, in abbreviated form). In more modern times, “G-god” is often misunderstood when it comes to its use in ancient biblical and related texts, since being called “a divine being” or “a god” in these ancient contexts would not have been considered “polytheistic” in the sense often thought of today by believers in the doctrine of the Trinity (those who redefine “G-god” in biblical texts in order to try and avoid the perceived problem of polytheism). Rather, the biblical presentation of the “one God” (see 1 Corinthians 8:6) would have been understood in the light of the “S/sons of God” theology presented throughout biblical and related writings (see Genesis 6:2, 4; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Psalm 89:6; compare also the Greek LXX reading of Deuteronomy 32:8 [“angels of God”] with the pre-Masoretic readings in Qumran fragments 4QDt^q and 4QDt^d, which support the reading “sons of God” against MT’s “sons of Israel”). Paul Sanders (*The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32* [OTS 37; Leiden: Brill, 1996]) discusses the relationship between Jah and the gods spoken of in Deut 32:8, 12, 39, and 43, where we read about “sons of God” and also about how there are ‘no gods with Jah,’ concluding on page 427:

Verse 12 and verse 39 say that there is no god ‘with’ YHWH. These affirmations relate to his activity: YHWH is the only god who acts on behalf of Israel. In that respect there is no other god with him. ... Though the conceptual background of the passage [Deut 32:8-9] may be archaic the message of the passage is completely in line with the ‘monotheistic’ affirmations in the song: other gods may exist—in fact they do—but for Israel the only significant god is YHWH. He is even the highest god (עלִיִּים) and the other gods (בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים) are subordinate to him.” [Underlining added.]

According to John, Jude, and others who walked with Jesus of Nazareth, Jesus was not only one of these divine “sons of God” but he was *the* Son of God, the “firstborn,” to use Paul’s language (Colossians 1:15; Hebrews 1:6), which in biblical thought was used most often for *the beginning of one’s generative power* (see Genesis 49:3; Deuteronomy 21:17; Psalm 78:51; 105:36). Compare the use of *monogenēs* in John 1:18 and *archē* in Revelation 3:14; see also the use of *charaktēr* in Hebrews 1:3, all terms used to present and to explain Jesus’ nature in relation to God, to us. Further, as the promised Messiah, being “a god” in this way would have been understood in the same way it was foretold in biblical literature that the Messiah would be called “a mighty god,” as in the Hebrew text of Isaiah 9:6, which the LXX again translates in part by using the Greek word for “angel.” This is also done for the Hebrew words for “G-god” in Psalm 8:5(6) (compare Hebrews 2:7, 9), in Psalm 96(7):7, and in Psalm 138:1 (compare also the Greek version of Sirach 45:2-3). In all of these instances we find the Greek equivalent for “angels” in the LXX for the Hebrew word *’elohim*. See also Hebrews 1:6 for the LXX quotation of Deuteronomy 32:43, which uses “angels” for “gods.” Then there is Judges 13:22, where Manoah associates the majestic term for “God” or “a god” (Hebrew: *’elohim*) with what he ‘saw,’ namely, “the flame ascended from off the altar heavenward” and ‘Jaho(h)-ah’s angel [*mal’ak Yaho(h)-ah hu*] ascend in the flame’ (verses 20-21). Therefore, it is clear that in biblical literature and thought from early times all the way into the late first century CE God’s angelic S/sons who represent him could be and were, in fact, “gods” in that they represent God, not themselves nor their own will, as ‘spirit beings and not as men’ (compare Isaiah 31:3; Hosea 11:9). The second significant description or identification made by Jude in verse 5 is that the “Christ” was a preexistent being, in fact, the very angel whom Jaho(h)-ah used when he delivered the Israelites “out of Egypt” (see Exodus 14:19 and Numbers 20:16; compare Exodus 23:20, 23; 32:34; 33:2). Then Jude describes Jesus further as the angel who later “destroyed those who did not believe” (compare Numbers 14:22-23, 29, 35). This same teaching, but with different aspects of the Christ’s preexistent involvement with Israel, is found in 1 Corinthians 10:4-10. Note that in verse 10 Paul speaks of the one who executed Jah’s justice against Israel as “the destroyer” (*tou olothreutou*). In Mark 1:24 and Luke 4:34 Jesus is also identified as “the holy one of God” by spirits who recognized him as the one appointed to “destroy” them. In Hebrews 11:28 the angel who slew all of the firstborn of the Egyptians (Exodus 12:29) is called “the destroying one” (*ho olothreuōn*), just as we find written in the LXX of Exodus 12:23, which also says Jah would “not allow the destroying one [*ton olethreuonta*] to enter into the houses” of the Israelites who followed Moses’ direction (Exodus 12:21). Finally, in Revelation 9:11 “the angel of the abyss,” who is also a “king,” is given the name in Hebrew *Abaddōn* and in Greek *Apollyōn*, both of which mean, “Destroyer.” While P⁷²

teaches the preexistence of Jesus clearly by referring to “Christ” as the appointed “destroyer” and deliverer of Jah’s people “out of Egypt,” other texts including A and B use the name “Jesus,” which also explicitly teaches his preexistence here in Jude 5 as the one who delivered the Israelites from Egypt. The only other possible reference is eliminated well in the discussion of this text by Carroll D. Osburn (“Discourse Analysis and Jewish Apocalyptic in the Epistle of Jude,” in *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*, David Alan Black, ed. [Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1992], page 295):

At least since Jerome (*contra Jov.* 1), Jesus [Ἰησοῦς] has been viewed here as a reference to Joshua, as in Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8 ... This view is not without serious defect, though, for while Joshua did lead Israel into the promised land, the actual destruction of Israel to which Jude refers cannot be ascribed to the son of Nun [Joshua also did not lead the people “out of Egypt” (GS)]. ... in view of Hebrews 11:26 and 1 Corinthians 10:1-11, there is no reason why Jude could not have written “Jesus” with this understanding in the mid-first century

^γ Or, ‘who did not reserve/hold back their own authority.’

^δ Or, ‘by pursuing sexual desires unusual/uncommon to human beings.’

^ε Or, ‘as a pattern.’

^ς Or, ‘fire.’

^η Some manuscripts, including \aleph (a fourth century CE manuscript [“Sinaiticus”]) use a plural here (*kyriotēta*) which appears to indicate real, human “lordships” or “authorities,” though spiritual “authorities” could also be in view, particularly since verse 9 provides an example involving potentially related spiritual “authorities” in the figures of Michael, Satan, and “the Lord” (see verse 9). P⁷² uses the singular *kyriotēs*.

^θ The word which I have translated as, “the presence of glorious beings,” is the plural form of the word for “glory” (*doxas*). This could refer to the kind of holy “glories” that could have belonged to those who chose instead to reject “our [only] Absolute Ruler and our Lord Jesus Christ” (verse 4). Or the plural for “glories” could be translated as “glorious ones” in reference to other, ‘higher authority beings’ or ‘powers,’ the same or similar to those indicated previously by “authority”/“lordship” and who are, perhaps, also in view in part in verse 9, namely, “Michael” and “the Lord (Jaho[h]-ah).”

^ι Or, ‘argued over.’

^κ Or, ‘slander.’

^λ Or, ‘May Lord [Jaho(h)-ah] rebuke/consider your behavior.’ Later Christian writers including Clement of Alexandria (who lived from around 150 to 220 CE) and Origen (who lived from around 185 to 253 CE) refer this account to the work known as the “Assumption (= ‘taking up’) of Moses.” However, the ending of this work has been lost and what we do have of it today does not contain any account like what we read about in Jude 9, that is, where Michael is disputing with Satan over Moses’ body. Clement writes: “‘When Michael, the archangel, disputing with the devil, debated about the body of Moses.’ Here he [Jude] confirms the assumption of Moses [Latin: *Hic confirmat assumptionem Moysi*]” (ANF 2, page 573, under, “Comments on the Epistle of Jude,” in the section, “Fragments of Cassiodorus” [mid-5th century CE]). Yet, according to Johannes Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), pages 273-274:

The most natural translation of [Clement’s] annotation is: ‘Here he confirms that Moses was taken up.’ ... Therefore, this passage is not evidence that Clement knew [about the writing known as the Assumption of Moses], nor that Jude 9 is a quotation from [the Assumption of Moses].

However, according to Tromp (*The Assumption of Moses*, page 274) the reference by Origen in his work *De Principiis* (“On First Principles”), in section 3.2.1, “may be taken to confirm the provenance of Jude 9 from [the Assumption of Moses].” Whether this is in fact the case is still not confirmable by any extant part of the

Assumption of Moses, but it may be that the account described in Jude 9 was a part of the now lost ending of this work. As is noted by Tromp (*The Assumption of Moses*, page 273), words similar to those attributed to Michael in Jude 9 occur also in Zechariah 3:2. In fact, in the LXX the exact same word for “rebuke” is used, namely, ἐπιτιμῆσαι (*epitimēsai*). So the tradition of Michael resisting the Devil’s attempts to accuse or to misuse the person or the body of God’s servants by asking Jaho(h)-ah to “rebuke” Satan was known apart from the Assumption of Moses. My use of “Jaho(h)-ah” in brackets in verse 5 is due to the use here in P⁷² of a sacred name abbreviation for the word for “Lord” (κ̅ς), which was one of if not the most common replacement used for the divine name during this period in the 3rd century CE. Further, while I still cannot say for sure if the original (if written) source or if the oral tradition involved with this account had Michael using the divine name rather than the Hebrew or Aramaic words for “Lord,” because of the frequency with which the divine name is used of God into the first century CE and because of the use here in P⁷² of κ̅ς, which does often stand for the divine name, I have used the divine name in brackets to show my view that the divine name may have been used in place of the *nomen sacra* (“sacred name”) abbreviation for “Lord” found more than a couple hundred years later in the P⁷² text of Jude’s letter.

^u Or, ‘corrupted.’

^v “Balaak” (*balaak*) is the reading in P⁷². Other texts including B read, ‘Balaam,’ the one who hired Balak to curse Israel according to Numbers Chapter 21.

^ξ For the earliest Christians, eating together with “expressions of spiritual love” involved eating of bread and drinking wine which symbolized Jesus of Nazareth’s body and blood given in sacrifice for the life of others according to the Law of Moses. This is also the essential Christian eating practice or ritual tied to each individual Christian’s acceptance of Jesus’ life, of his teachings, and of his death and of what it means according to the promises made through Abraham (Isaiah 53:5; John 3:16; Acts 7:2; Galatians 3:9, 14; Hebrews 2:14-15; 9:15; 1 Peter 2:21-24; 1 John 2:6). This practice is outlined and discussed in the New Testament (Matthew 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:19-20; 1 Corinthians 11:20-34; compare Revelation 3:20; 19:9). It is also testified to by early non-Christians such as Pliny the Younger (61 – 112 CE) who in his letter to Trajan (Roman Emperor during 98 – 117 CE) wrote, in part, about the investigated and found-out practices of Christians living during this time and in Pliny’s Roman province (with my underlining added):

They [the Christians] affirmed, however, the whole of their guilt, or their error, was, that they were in the habit of meeting on a certain fixed day before it was light, when they sang in alternate verses a hymn to Christ, as to a god [compare Jude 5 in P⁷²], and bound themselves by a solemn oath, not to any wicked deeds, but never to commit any fraud, theft or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to deliver it up; after which it was their custom to separate, and then reassemble to partake of food but food of an ordinary and innocent kind. [Pliny the Younger to the Emperor Trajan, Book 10, Letter 96 (from the 1915 *Leob Classical Library* edition at VRoma.org [link: <http://www.vroma.org/~hwalker/Pliny/Pliny10-096-E.html>] as of January 18, 2012).]

^o Here in verses 14 and 15 Jude refers to what was known as a prophecy from “Enoch, the seventh man from Adam” (compare Genesis 4:17; 1 Enoch 60:8). The book known as “1 Enoch” comes primarily from a 15th century CE Ethiopic version, which preserves the entire work. But 1 Enoch also has textual support from some Greek and Latin fragments which mostly date from around the 6th and 8th centuries CE, except for the Chester Beatty-Michigan Papyrus dated to the 4th century CE, which preserves 1 Enoch 97:6-107:3 in Greek. More important, fragments of the book of 1 Enoch were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, which preserve Aramaic portions of the book of 1 Enoch dating from the late 3rd century BCE (see, for examples, 4QEn^{a-g}, 4QEnastr^{a-d}, and 1QGiants^{a-b}). The words used by Jude (in verses 14-15), namely, “Behold! The Lord comes with thousands of angels! He brings about judgment concerning all things and he makes plain the error of every living thing, concerning all kinds of terrible things which they spoke against him, in spite of their being wicked sinners,” come from 1 Enoch 1:9, with slight variation in wording due to the nature and the application by Jude of 1 Enoch 1:9 so that it is most useful for the purpose of his letter. P⁷² therefore becomes a 3rd century CE Greek witness to the text of 1 Enoch 1:9, which is also supported by the Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch found in 4QEn^c. See Osburn, “Discourse Analysis and Jewish Apocalyptic in the Epistle of Jude,” pages 303-307, for

more on the similarities and differences between Jude 14-15 and 1 Enoch 1:9. On page 307, Osburn concludes his section on Jude 14-16 with these remarks:

In verses 5-16 [inclusive of verses 14-15], then, Jude has utilized the historical incident in Numbers 14:26ff, supported by several well-known pseudepigraphical selections in contemporary literature as a fundamental warning admonition that the ungodliness of the intruders, specified in verses 4, 8, 10, 12, and 16, would result in certain condemnation when Jesus returns in eschatological judgment.

^π Or, 'words.'

^ρ Or, 'before.'

^ς Or, 'rebuild.'

^σ Or, 'among a living age.'

^τ Or, 'who hesitate'; perhaps even, 'who dispute.'